ELEVENTH REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMAND FOR GRANTS (2000-2001)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 24 April, 2000
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 24 April, 2000

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2000/Vaisakha, 1922 (Saka)

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Corrigenda to the 11th Report
(13th Lok Sabha)

Page	Para	Line	For	Read
(iii)	-	11 from top	Shri Swadesh Chakraborty	Shri Swadesh Chakrabortty
24	-	3 from bottom	county	country
37	-	Sl. No. 8	Himacha Pradesh	Himachal Pradesh
45	-	16 from top	Shri Swadesh Chakraborty	Shri Swadesh Chakrabortty

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ..... (iii)

ABBREVIATIONS ..... (v)

INTRODUCTION ..... (vii)

REPORT

CHAPTER I Introductory 1

CHAPTER II An overall analysis of the Demand for Grants 2000-2001 of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) 2

CHAPTER III Overall scenario of Rural sanitation in the country 24

APPENDICES

I. Statement showing 8th Plan outlay (outlay sanctioned and expenditure made) and 9th Plan (outlay proposed and sanctioned), BE 1998-99, RE 1998-99, Actual 1998-99, BE 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001 (Plan) 28

II. Statement showing 8th Plan outlay (outlay sanctioned and expenditure made) and 9th Plan (outlay proposed and sanctioned), BE 1998-99, RE 1998-99, Actual 1998-99, BE 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001 (Non-Plan) 29

III. Statement showing expenditure and coverage of villages/habitations under Rural Water Supply Programme 30

IV. Financial Progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP and MNP) during 1998-99 32

PAGE

V. Financial Progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP and MNP) during 1999-2000 36

VI. List of pilot districts for Institutionalising Community Participation in Rural Water Supply Programme 40

VII. Minutes of the Seventh Sitting of the Committee held on 22.3.2000 42

VIII. Minutes of the Twelfth Sitting of the Committee held on 5.4.2000 45

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri A. Brahmanaiah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
10. Prof. Kailasho Devi
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
13. Shri R.L. Jalappa
14. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
15. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
16. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
17. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
*18. Shri Punnulal Mohale
19. Shrimati Ranee Narah
20. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
21. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
22. Shri Chandresh Patel
23. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
**24. Prof. (Smt.) A.K. Premajam

---

*Nominated *w.e.f.* 6.4.2000 *vice* Shri Vijay Goel.
**Nominated *w.e.f.* 24.1.2000.

25. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
26. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
27. Shri Maheshwar Singh
28. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

@31. Shri S. Agni Raj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri C. Apok Jamir
$36. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
37. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
**38. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
$39. Dr. Mohan Babu
40. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
41. Shri N. Rajendran
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
43. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
44. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

@Nominated *w.e.f.* 16.3.2000.

**Died on 13.1.2000.

$Ceased to be member of the Committee *w.e.f.* 2nd April, 2000 consequent upon their retirement from Rajya Sabha.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.C.A.	—	Additional Central Assistance
A.E.	—	Actual Expenditure
A.R.W.S.P.	—	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
B.E.	—	Budget Estimate
C.R.S.P.	—	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
D.R.D.A.	—	District Rural Development Agency
D.W.S.C.	—	District Water and Sanitation Committees
F.C.	—	Fully Covered
H.R.D.	—	Human Resource Development
M.I.S.	—	Management Information Systems
M.N.P.	—	Minimum Needs Programme
N.A.F.G.	—	National Agenda for Governance
N.C.	—	Not Covered
O. & M.	—	Operation and Maintenance
P.C.	—	Partially Covered
P.H.E.Ds	—	Public Health Engineering Departments
P.M.G.Y.	—	Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana
P.R.Is	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
R.C.R.S.P.	—	Restructured Central Rural Sanitation Programme
R.G.N.D.W.M.	—	Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission
R. & D.	—	Research and Development
T.S.C.	—	Total Sanitation Campaign
U.Ts	—	Union Territories
W.A.T.S.A.N.	—	Water and Sanitation Mission

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Eleventh Report on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply).

2. Demand for Grants have been examined by the Committee under Rule 331E(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) on the 22nd March, 2000.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on the 5th April, 2000.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) for placing before them the requisite material in connection with the examination of the subject. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment who appeared before the Committee and placed their considered views.

6. They would also like to place on record their sense of deep appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
18 *April*, 2000
29 *Chaitra*, 1922 *(Saka)*

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

INTRODUCTORY

1.1 The Ministry of Rural Development consists of three Departments (i) Department of Rural Development; (ii) Department of Land Resources and (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

1.2 In order to give focussed attention towards the objective of providing potable drinking water to all the villages, a separate Department for Drinking Water Supply has been created *w.e.f.* October, 1999. The provision of drinking water supply and extension of sanitation facilities to the rural poor are the main components of the activities of this Department.

1.3 The Department of Drinking Water Supply implements the following *important* programmes:

1. Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP); and

2. Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP)

1.4 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for 2000-2001 is for Rs. 2101.29 crore.

1.5 The Demand for Grants of the Department is presented to Parliament under Demand No. 72.

1.6 The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department was laid in Lok Sabha on the 9th March 2000.

1.7 In the present Report, Committee have examined the implementation of centrally sponsored schemes/programmes *viz.* (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme, and (ii) Central Rural Sanitation programme in the context of the budgetary allocation for the year 2000-2001.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMAND FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 2000-2001 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY (MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

Objective for creating a separate Department of Drinking Water Supply

2.1 Rural water supply and sanitation were earlier parts of the Department of Rural Development. Now a separate Department to deal with these areas has been created. When asked about the objectives for creating a separate Department, it has been submitted in the written replies furnished by the Government that the National Agenda for Governance of the Government of India envisages availability of potable drinking water to all villages in the next five years. In order to give focussed attention towards the laudable objective, the Department of Drinking Water Supply has been newly created in the Ministry of Rural Development.

2.2 The Committee hope that with the creation of a separate Department of Drinking Water Supply, more focussed attention would be given to achieving the target of making available potable drinking water to all habitations and schools within the time-frame of five years (2000-2005) stipulated in the National Agenda for Governance. To this end, the Committee urge:—

- **high-level political coordination between the Centre and the States to achieve the time-bound target in an area which falls primarily within the competence of the States;**
- **entrusting the fundamental responsibility of planning and implementation of the programmes of the Department to the Panchyat Raj Institutions; and**
- **the provisions of adequate funds on a priority basis to achieve the social right of all citizens to potable drinking water in accordance with the Directive Principles of State Policy.**

While appreciating the importance being attached by the Government, to the supply of drinking water, the Committee feel that the Central Rural Sanitation Programme is no less important than the drinking water supply. They therefore, recommend that the said programme should also be given due importance and efforts made to make it a success.

Comparative position of the outlay during 8th and 9th Plan

2.3 The Comparative position of the outlay of the schemes/ programmes of the Department *i.e.* Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Rural Sanitation Programme during 8th Plan (outlay sanctioned and expenditure made) and 9th Plan (outlay proposed and sanctioned, BE 1998-99, RE 1998-99, Actuals 1998-99 BE 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001) under Plan and Non-Plan heads are given at **Appendices I and II** respectively.

Drinking Water Supply

The overall scenario of coverage of habitations

2.4 The status of coverage of habitations as on 1.4.1999 is as given below:

Type of coverage	No. of habitations (as on 1.4.1999)
Not covered (NC)	34460
Partially covered (PC)	232887
Fully covered (FC)	1163196
Total	1430543

Drinking water supply to rural schools

2.5 As per the data furnished by the Government, the total number of rural primary and upper primary schools in the country is 6,36,827 out of which 2,85,438 have drinking water facility. There are about 3 lakh schools which are yet to be provided with drinking water facilities. It is proposed to provide drinking water facilities to approximately 1.5 lakh schools in the next five years in the ARWSP. The Eleventh Finance Commission has been requested to consider devolution of funds to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) to provide drinking water facilities to the remaining schools.

Planning on the part of the Government to cover all NC and PC habitations

2.6 The National Agenda for Governance of the Government of India envisages availability of potable drinking water to all the villages in the next five years. As regards the planning of the Government to achieve the said laudable objective, it has been submitted in the written replies that all State Governments have been requested to prepare Action Plans clearly indicating the total requirement of funds year-wise to achieve the said laudable objective. Action plans prepared by 25 States/UT Governments have been received.

2.7 Comprehensive Action Plans from Bihar, Orissa, Manipur and the UTs of A&N Islands, Lakshadweep, Chandigarh and Daman and Diu have not been received so far. According to the information received till date approximately Rs. 11063.45 crore would be required as Central share with at least equal matching share from the State Governments to provide for the remaining not covered and partially covered habitations with drinking water facilities during next five years. It has been further stated that as per the rough estimates, Rs. 14,500 crore would be required during the period 1999-2004 for full coverage of NC and PC habitations alone. Besides this, additional funds would be required to tackle the problems of water quality and sustainability.

2.8 As per para 2.9.2 of the guidelines, the States/UTs shall prepare annual action plans six months before the commencement of the financial year. Thus for the year 2000-2001, the State Government were required to finalise their annual plan by October, 1999. When asked whether States/UTs have furnished their annual plan by October, 1999 as stipulated in the guidelines it has been submitted in the written reply that none of the States submitted annual plan by October, 1999. It has further been submitted by the Government that action plan of most of the States would be finalised by the end of May, 2000.

2.9 **Proposal by the Ministry and the allocation made by the Planning Commission**

Rs. in crore

8th Plan outlay	5100.00
Expenditure incurred	4142.71
Proposed outlay during 9th Plan	18000.00
Outlay as agreed by the Planning Commission	8150.00

Year	Proposal by the Ministry	Provided by the Planning Commission
1997-98	4427.00	1302.00
1998-99	3000.00	1627.00
1999-2000	3000.00	1800.00
2000-2001	3000.00	1960.00 (provisional)

2.10 The Secretary during evidence stated that the remaining habitations to be covered in the country are in the difficult areas, which need more allocation. When asked about the number of uncovered habitations in difficult terrains in the country at present and how many are proposed to be covered during 2000-2001, it has been submitted by the Department that the details regarding the exact nature of the habitation-wise terrain in respect of the remaining not covered and partially covered habitations are not being maintained at the Central level.

2.11 The Committee, when informed that out of 14,30,543 habitations, only 2,67,347 habitations *i.e.* around 18.6% of the total habitations remained PC or NC, are sceptical about the structuring of the data in this regard, especially when a large number of FC habitations re-emerge as NC habitations for want of continued sustenance. In case if all these FC habitations that re-emerge as NC habitations for want of sustenance are also included in the data relating to PC and NC habitations, then the data relating to the number of NC and PC habitations would have been higher showing a dismal performance of the Government. The Committee therefore feel that there should be a realistic assessment of PC and NC habitations, keeping in mind the number of FC habitations reemerging as NC habitations, so that physical and financial targets are properly planned for achieving the objective of the Government.

2.12 The Committee are constrained to note the position of drinking water in rural schools. It is really pathetic to find that even after more than 52 years of independence more than 50% of rural schools do not have access to drinking water. While noting that 30,000 schools have been planned to be covered during 2000-2001, they recommend that all efforts should be made to achieve the targets with in stipulated time.

2.13 While noting the objective of the Government to cover all PC and NC habitations in the rural areas in the country during the next five years, the Committee have their own doubts about achievement of the objective in view of the fact that just 50% of what the Government had asked for has been sanctioned by the Planning Commission in the 9th Plan. Further even after passing of nearly one year since the National Agenda for Governance was put into operation, the Government are yet to receive the comprehensive action plans from some of the State Governments. Further none of the State Governments furnished their annual action plans by October, 1999 as stipulated in the guidelines, this wasting at least a sixth of the financial year, 2000-2001. The Committee would, therefore, like to be apprised of the details of those States/UTs which did not furnish the annual plans as stipulated in the guidelines. It is astonishing to note that the Government till date do not have the extensive details regarding the exact nature of the habitation-wise terrain in respect of NC and PC habitations. The Committee fail to understand how the estimates about the required allocation are being proposed without knowing the exact scenario. The Committee therefore urge that the Government should urgently furnish the State-wise details relating to NC and PC habitations.

2.14 The Committee feel that the full coverage of all habitations and schools in rural areas in country within the next 5 years through the ARWSP and MNP programmes is a highly target-oriented programme which should neither further wait nor lag behind for was to sufficient outlay. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend that through high level, concerted coordination between he Government and the Planning Commission, the outlay under ARWSP and MNP should be enhanced adequately so as to achieve the laudable objectives.

2.15 The Government and the Planning Commission should urgently consider at the highest possible level, in consultation with high-level State authorities, the exponential increases in financial allocations and disbursements required to attain the drinking water goals of the National Agenda for Governance, and the political and administrative steps that need to be taken, including the key question of the empowerment of the Panchayats in this regard, as provided for the Constitution. In this context the role of the Gram Sabhas

needs specific attention, with the role of the Gram Sabhas in Fifth Schedule Areas being defined in terms of the provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 passed by Parliament. The Department should also coordinate with the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Women and Child Development) the responsibilities which could be entrusted to the Gram Mahila Sabhas set up under the Indira Mahila Yojana. Moreover, the disturbingly low priority being given to rain water conservation, including traditional methods of water conservation, as well as the miniscule expenditure being incurred on this vital matter, needs urgent high-level review.

Lump-sum provision for the benefit of the North-Eastern Region and Sikkim

2.16 As per Ministry of Finance instructions, 10% of the total outlay of the Department has been taken out from each scheme which amounts to Rs. 210 crore and shown separately in the budget under Head 2552. When asked whether any separate guidelines have been issued for this purpose, it has been clarified by the Government that no such separate guidelines have been issued. The allocated funds would be released to North-Eastern States and Sikkim as per the approved allocation criteria for implementation of Rural Water Supply Scheme in accordance with the existing guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme.

2.17 When asked whether the said lump-sum provision would be non-lapsable, it has been stated in the written note that Planning Commission is being consulted and the required information would be furnished as soon as it is finalised.

2.18 The Committee appreciate the steps taken by the Government to provide 10% of the total allocation of the Department to the North-Eastern States and Sikkim. They hope that the modalities of allocating the outlay would be finalised in consultation with the Planning Commission expeditiously and the Committee apprised accordingly. It is further desired that the Government should review the absorption capacity of the North-Eastern States so as to ensure 100% utilisation of the scarce resources.

Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)

Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) and Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM)

2.19 When asked about the relations between the ARWSP, MNP and RGNDWM, it has been stated by the Government that the National Drinking Water Mission, later renamed as Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM), was introduced as one of the Societal Mission in 1986 in order to provide drinking water to all rural habitations.

2.20 The Government have also informed that ARWSP is being implemented through RGNDWM for which funds are provided to the States for supplementing their efforts in providing drinking water facilities to rural habitations.

2.21 According to Government, Minimum Needs programme (MNP) is a State Sector Programme for which the Planning Commission allocates funds to each State for implementing certain programmes, including provision of drinking water facilities.

2.22 When asked about the new Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana, it was submitted that it envisages, provision of additional central assistance (ACA) to the States for implementation of various activities including drinking water supply. The modalities are being finalised by the Planning Commission.

2.23 When asked about the justification of Mission when a separate Department of Drinking Water Supply has been created, it has been stated that as per the Ministry of Finance OM No. 10(4)-E(coord.)/85 dated 8.6.1988, the Mission Director has financial and administrative powers as delegated to the head of the department, so as to ensure speedy, effective and focussed attention on the implementation of the Rural Water Supply Programme. All necessary policy initiatives are proposed by the Mission for ensuring access to drinking water to all rural habitations in the country.

2.24 When asked about the logic of monitoring two programmes ARWSP and MNP, when the funds are given for both from the Central sector, it has been stated that the ARWSP funds are to be spent for providing drinking water facilities in rural habitations as per the guidelines for implementation of rural water supply programme. As such State Governments are not supposed to spend ARWSP funds for establishment activities. States meet their establishment expenditure on implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme from their own resources.

2.25 When asked about the details of the main technological or managerial insights attributable to RGNDWM, it has been submitted by the Government that technical expertise on water supply sector especially on sustainability and quality issues is available in the Mission, which helps in policy formulation, strategies for implementation and evaluation of programme in the sector.

2.26 For achieving the single objective of providing drinking water to rural areas, the Committee feel that the operation of a plethora of schemes is chaotic as well as create a situation where monitoring becomes difficult. They therefore disfavour the operation of multiple schemes like ARWSP, MNP of the Department and PMGY of Planning Commission. The Committee strongly recommend that the allocation under the different schemes/programmes should be brought under one scheme/programme keeping in view the fact that a separate Department to deal with the problem of drinking water supply has already been created. The Committee are concerned at the apparent confusion over the precise relationship between the RGNDWM and the newly-created Department. They recommend that the relationship be clarified in terms of the "mode" established for societal mission in 1986 and the administrative/financial responsibilities which now devolve on the new Department. The Committee regret that, despite having been requested to do so, the Department has not been able to furnish any information about the technological and managerial insights attributable to RGNDWM, and suggest that these be taken into consideration in defining the role of the Mission and its relationship to the Department.

Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) Central Sector and Minimum Needs Programme — Expenditure Position

Details regarding the annual allocation, the expenditure at the Central level and the expenditure reported by the States/UTs are given below:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Allocation	Expenditure by the Ministry	Expenditure reported by the States/UTs implementing agencies
1997-98	1302.00	1299.91	1676.44
1998-99	1612.00	1610.64	1893.58
1999-2000	1800.00	1222.23	1057.54*

*Provisional.

Details regarding the annual targets and achievements in respect of coverage of habitations and population are as under:—

Year	Target (ARWSP+MNP)		Achievements (ARWSP+MNP)	
	No. of villages/ habitations	Population (in lakh)	Villages/habitations Covered	Population benefited (in lakh)
1997-98	99613	302.788	116994	366.15
1998-99	10492	357.470	112933	345.27
1999-2000	90061	319.985	37541* 43476**	130.28*

* Provisional

** updated as per the information received upto 28th March, 2000

2.27 The statement showing expenditure and coverage of habitations under Rural Water Supply has been given at *Appendix III*.

2.28 The Committee observe from the data given above and in *Appendix III;*

- **there has been a drastic fall of nearly Rs. 800 crore between 1998-99 and 1999-2000 on expenditure reported by States/UTs and implementing agencies;**
- **the number of habitations covered has shrunk by more that half, from 1.13 lakh in 1998-99 to 0.43 lakh (provisional) in 1999-2000;**
- **this has resulted in a dramatic decrease in the annual percentage growth of physical achievement from over 9 per cent and 8 per cent respectively in the previous two years to just over 3 per cent in the last financial year;**
- **that it took 13 years for the ratio of financial to physical achievement to double from 1986 to 1999, whereas in a single year, 1999-2000, the ratio has more than doubled.**

2.29 The Committee desire that the implications of these serious shortfalls be carefully assessed by the Government and corrective action taken urgently. Equally, it is essential that a scientific State-wise/district-wise survey be made of 'private water sources with accessibility to the public', to ensure that this newly included sources is properly estimated and fully tapped.

The position of Opening Balances

	(Rs. in crore)
1998-99	221.82
1999-2000	355.15

2.30 It has been admitted by the Government in their written note that funds released during the last quarter of the year is one of the reasons for huge unspent balances in some States/UTs.

2.31 The Committee take serious note of the reduction in targets during 1999-2000 and further drastic decline in the achievement as compared to previous two years. The Committee feel that the under-utilisation of outlay and slippage in targets are the major reasons for getting the lesser allocation from the Planning Commission. They therefore, recommend that the Government should take necessary corrective steps to ensure 100% utilisation of funds and achievement of the set targets. Further the Committee are concerned over the mechanism of implementing the scheme whereby substantial funds are earmarked at the fag end of the year simply to inflate the data resulting in huge unspent balances. It is desired that the Government should endeavour to ensure that the funds are released by the Centre to States and by States to the implementing agencies in a phased manner throughout the year.

State/UT-wise position of Financial Achievement

1998-99

2.32 The statement showing the position during 1998-99 of Financial Achievement has been given at *Appendix IV*. It could be seen therefrom that under MNP while 92.05% allocation has been shown as expenditure, in State like Kerala, Nagaland, Punjab, D&N Haveli the expenditure position is very poor. Further under ARWSP, over-all 95.06% of funds have been shown as the expenditure, however, in Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, J&K, Manipur, Nagaland, Punjab and D&N Haveli, there is huge under-spending.

1999-2000

2.33 The statement showing the position of Financial Achievement during 1999-2000 is given at *Appendix V*.

2.34 While under ARWSP, 96.06% of the allocation has been shown as expenditure under MNP, the percentage of expenditure is only 52.25%. In 16 States/UTs, the position of expenditure is lesser than 50% under ARWSP. Under MNP the position of expenditure is lesser than 50% in 17 States/UTs.

2.35 In the following States/UTs, though allocation has been made no releases have been made during the year.

Bihar, Goa, Manipur, A&N Islands, D&N Haveli, Daman and Diu and Lakshadweep.

In the case of Delhi neither any allocation has been made nor any fund released as all the habitations are reported to have been covered.

2.36 When asked about the reasons for under-utilisation in ARWSP and MNP during 1998-99 and 1999-2000, a general reply has been furnished stating that the remaining uncovered habitations in most of the States are located in difficult areas like hilly terrain, desert areas, etc. and as such, the time taken for implementation of the schemes is comparatively high and the utilisation of funds will be low. The low achievement is also due to civil disturbances and late release of funds by the respective State Finance Departments.

2.37 It has further been stated in the written note that Union Territories like A&N Islands, D&N Haveli, Daman and Diu and Lakshadweep, are not availing ARWSP funds as they meet their expenditure for rural water supply activities from their own resources.

2.38 As per the information furnished by the respective Governments, the status of coverage of rural habitations with drinking water facilities in the above UTs as on 01.04.1999 is as under:

UTs	Not covered Habitations	Partially Covered Habitations	Fully Covered Habitations	Total number of Habitations
A&N Islands	11	06	487	504
D&N Haveli	128	190	198	516
Daman & Diu	00	01	28	29
Lakshadweep	00	10	00	10
Delhi	00	00	200	200

2.39 As per the information furnished by the Government of NCT of Delhi, all the rural habitations have been covered with drinking water facilities. As such, no allocation was made for Delhi. Moreover, Government of NCT of Delhi has not been drawing the ARWSP funds during the previous years as they meet their expenditure for rural water supply activities from their own resources.

2.40 The Committee are not inclined to accept the vague reply furnished by the Government when asked about the under-utilisation of ARWSP and MNP outlay in various States/UTs during 1998-99 and 1999-2000. They feel that without analysing the position State/UT-wise, the Department has tried to furnish a general reply. The Committee take serious view of the attitude of the Government in taking action on the observations made by them. The Committee desire that the Government should critically analyse the position in each State/UT in regard to unspent funds and take corrective steps to ensure 100% utilisation of funds.

2.41 It is noted with surprise that Union Territories of A&N Islands, D&N Haveli, Daman and Diu, Lakhadweep are not availing of ARWSP funds, inspite of the fact that NC/PC habitations still exist in said UTs. The Committee urge that such UTs should be requested to avail of ARWSP funds so that all NC and PC habitations in the UTs are fully covered at the earliest.

2.42 As regards Delhi, the committee would like that some outlay under ARWSP should be earmarked for maintenance and quality related problem etc., as these are also components of ARWSP, though coverage of habitations in Delhi has been completed.

Review of the revised guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme

Pilot projects prepared as per the new guidelines

2.43 As per the new policy initiatives taken by the Government, the Cabinet approved that 20% of the annual outlay under ARWSP be earmarked for providing incentives to States which implement projects to institutionalise community based rural water supply systems by incorporating the following three basic principles for ensuring people's participation:

— adoption of a demand-driven responsive and adaptable approach based on empowerment of villagers to ensure their full participation in the project through a decision making role in the choice of scheme design, control of finances and management arrangements;

— shifting role of Government from direct service delivery to that the planning, policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation and partial financial support.

— partial cost sharing either in cash or kind or both and 100% responsibility of Operations and Maintenance by end-users.

2.44 Accordingly 58 districts have been identified by the State Governments for implementation of the pilot project, the names of which are given at *Appendix VI*. During the current year (1999-2000), 20% of outlay for RWS Programme was earmarked for the sector reform pilot projects. So far 43 pilot projects have been approved and sanctioned by the National Scheme Sanctioning Committee for implementation. First instalment in respect of 31 of these projects amounting to Rs. 21779.47 lakh has been released during 1999-2000 till 24.3.2000. The amount released is only 30% of the Government of India share of the approved cost and subsequent instalments will be released depending upon the progress made.

2.45 The Committee find that as per the revised guidelines 20% allocation is being made to 58 districts *i.e.* around 10% of the total districts. They are concerned to note that 90% of the districts are being deprived of their share of allocation by the new initiatives taken by the Government. The Committee are not inclined to accept the revised norms and would like that the criteria of allocation of the outlay should be same for all the districts and no district should be favoured at the cost of the other district.

2.46 The Committee are not moved by the argument of the Government that loading all O&M costs on the Panchayats is the optimal way of ensuring community participation in the maintenance of drinking water assets. The Government do not appear to have taken into account the glaring variations in the financial allotments to Panchayats as between different States nor to the continuing parlous state of panchayat finances notwithstanding the directives of the Tenth Finance Commission or the recommendations of the State Finance Commission. Until the Constitutional obligation of ensuring the "sound finances" of the Panchayats is met in adequate measure, the Panchayats will not be able to operate and maintain drinking water facilities at the level which will give "satisfaction" to all categories of users—which is the fundamental assumption behind this scheme. The end result of loading the entire financial

responsibility for O&M on users/Panchayats could be that the better-off will be better provided for and the worse-off will be neglected, or even abandoned. This is unacceptable. The Committee urge the Government to reconsider this matter to ensure that the proposed pilot projects are successfully implemented with a view to ensuring the rapid extension of the scheme to all districts. Moreover, it is the right and responsibility of the Government to establish criteria for the identification of districts for pilot projects. The Committee regret the voluntary abnegation of responsibility for this by the Government. Finally, it is the responsibility of the Government to sensitize external agencies to the need for providing local inputs in project formulation and the implementation of their "shelf of projects" and the imperative of rooting their proposed institutional set-up in the Constitutional scheme of elected local self-Government.

Dual Policy for Supply of Water

2.47 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that as per the new policy initiatives there will be dual water policy. *i.e.* for drinking and cooking treated water will be available, rest will be untreated. The existing norms of supply of drinking water is 40 liters of safe drinking water per capita per day (lpcd) for human beings.

2.48 The breakup of norm of 40 lpcd is as follows:

Purpose	Quantity (Lpcd)
Drinking	3
Cooking	5
Bathing	15
Washing utensils and house	7
Ablution	10

Accordingly, the requirement of non-treated water for other than drinking and cooking purposes works out to about 32 lpcd.

2.49 While appreciating the said dual policy for supply of water to rural habitations, the Committee would like that suitable guidelines should be issued to the State Governments to adhere to the norms fixed for the purpose and to ensure the quality of water to be supplied for drinking and cooking purposes.

Cessation of ARWSP as Centrally Sponsored Scheme

2.50 As per Para 3.7 of the revised guidelines gradually, over a period of time, in all the districts of all the States/UTs, community participation in rural water supply programme will be institutionalised. On completion of the projects, the States/UTs will take upon the responsibility to plan, approve and implement such projects based on their experience gained from implementing the pilot projects. Consequently, ARWSP (Normal) may cease to exist as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme.

2.51 When asked whether State Governments have been consulted before taking the said policy decision it has been submitted by the Government in their written note that the National Workshop on operation and Maintenance of Water Supply and Sanitation held in September, 1996 had recommended among other things, community participation in the O&M of Rural Water Supply Schemes.

2.52 Representatives of State Governments were also participants in the above workshop. As a follow up of the National Workshop, five regional workshops were held at Jaipur, Bangalore, Chandigarh, Guwahati and Calcutta. During these workshops all the States/UTs (except a few namely Goa, Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Delhi, Lakshadweep, Chandigarh and Pondicherry) prepared action plans for institutionalisation of community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme in the pilot districts identified by them for the purpose during the workshops.

Further, Para 3.1 of the guidelines links users getting 'the service they want' with their being 'willing to pay for it.'

2.53 It has further been clarified by the Government in their written note that subsequent to achievement of full coverage and institutionalisation of sector reforms in all districts, the Panchayats/ local communities would be required to meet only O&M and replacement cost.

2.54 The Committee note the innovative approach of the Government as quite idealistic. They express their doubts as to whether State Governments are in a position to take care of the requirement of outlay required for the purpose of providing drinking water supply to rural habitations. Even if it is stipulated that all the

habitations are covered, there are problems of maintenance of assets, sustainability of water sources, quality aspect, R&D, etc. for which a lot of funds are required. The Committee also have their own doubts on the success of the experience of maintenance by community on payment basis in each district. In the case of Panchayats looking after maintenance, the capacity building of Panchayats 'specifically their financial capacity' is the main issue which needs to be addressed. Keeping in view the above considerations, the Committee feel that the guidelines needs a review.

Incentive to better performing States

2.55 As per Para No. 2.10.11 of the revised guidelines, the unutilised fund under ARWSP, due to non-drawl/non-utilisation of the allocated amount by any State Government will be redistributed to the better performing Sates, towards the end of the financial year, as per the allocation criteria.

2.56 When asked about the steps taken by the Government to motivate the poor performing States it has been stated that under the Constitution drinking water supply is a State subject and the Central Government only supplements their efforts by providing assistance under the Centrally sponsored Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP). Accordingly, the States are expected to provide safe drinking water facilities to cover the entire rural population of the respective States with the funds provided to them for the purpose through MNP and ARWSP. However, the Central Government through constant interaction tries to enable the poor performing States to perform better.

2.57 While appreciating the policy of providing incentive to States performing better, the Committee are not able to accept the logic that providing drinking water supply is a State subject and the responsibility of motivating poorly performing States does not lie with the Central Government. The Committee are of the view that providing drinking water is equally the responsibility of the Central Government, that is why it has been given priority in the National Agenda for Governance. In view of it, the Committee feel that Central Government should take necessary steps to persuade and motivate the poorly performing States/UTs to consider the provision of safe drinking water to rural masses as their responsibility and to cooperate in the Central Sector schemes being operated for the purpose.

Role of Panchayats in the implementation of Drinking Water Programme

2.58 As per Para 3.8 of the revised guidelines PHEDs/Boards are the primary executing agencies for commissioning water supply schemes at the State level. Further, as per the new policy 100% sharing of O&M cost is to be made by the users. In the 'Foreword' to the guidelines it has been mentioned that with the introduction of the Panchayati Raj System under the Constitutional 73rd Amendment Act, 1992, the assets and the responsibility for operation and maintenance need to be transferred to the local Panchayats for effective repair and maintenance of the rural water supply schemes. When asked the reasons for referring only to maintenance of rural assets in the Foreword to the guidelines and not to the provision of drinking water as a whole, it has been admitted by the Government that it could have been more suitably worded. Further, it has been mentioned that as per Article 243G of the Constitution, the Legislature of a State may, by law, endow the Panchayats with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-Government and such law may contain provisions for the devolution of powers and responsibilities upon Panchayats at the appropriate level, subject to such conditions as may be specified therein, with respect to — (a) the preparation of plans for economic development and social justice, and (b) the implementation of schemes for economic development and social justice as may be entrusted to them including those in relation to the matters listed in the Eleventh Schedule which, *inter-alia*, includes drinking water and maintenance of community assets. As such, the responsibility of endowing the above-mentioned powers with the Panchayats is with the State Governments.

Community participation in the role of Panchayats in the implementation of Drinking Water Programme

2.59 When asked why the institutionalisation of community participation being diverted from the elected bodies it has been clarified by the Government in the written note that the institutionalisation of community participation has not been divorced from the elected local bodies. It has never been the intention of the Government to underestimate or ignore the potential of the Panchayati Raj system in the matter of providing drinking water to the rural population. Although, Constitution provides for entrusting the responsibility of

Drinking Water and Maintenance of Community Assets, many States are yet to transfer these responsibilities to the Panchayats. It is in this context that flexibility has been provided for in the guidelines for involving community in the implementation of sector reform projects. Para 8.2.1.c (as amended) of the guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme allows the States to constitute District Water and Sanitation Committees (DWSC) within the Zilla Parishad. The ultimate aim of the Department of Drinking Water Supply is to hand over the activities related to planning, implementation, O&M and replacement of the various rural water supply schemes to the elected local bodies. The present guidelines aim to initiate steps to strengthen the rural community to equip themselves to accept the above responsibilities and make use of the Sector Reforms initiatives for the purpose of demonstrating to the Panchayati Raj Institutions how community participation can be practically institutionalised. The experience gained during the implementation of sector reform projects in the 58 pilot districts will be subsequently expanded to all the districts.

2.60 The guidelines indicate that the Governing Body of WATSAN Mission shall be headed by Chairman of Zilla Parishad/Chairman, DRDA/Chairman, District Planning Committee. Chairman of the Standing Committees of Zilla Parishad would also be the members of the WATSAN Mission.

2.61 The basic purpose of consulting Gram Sabha is to involve the community in decision making in matter affecting their lives. Under Sector Reforms, the decisions are to be taken by the community themselves. The Fifth Schedule Areas are Tribal Areas, whereas the guidelines are for the entire country.

2.62 The Committee find that although it has been accepted by the Government that their ultimate aim is to hand over the activities related to planning, implementation, O&M etc. to the Panchayat/ legally authorised local authorities, yet the Government appear to be hesitant over using their full persuasive powers to urge State Governments at the highest possible level to devolve to the Panchayats/legally authorised local authorities the required finances and executive powers, authority and responsibility to fulfill the high duty which ought to be vested in the Panchayats of ensuring drinking

water facilities for all at the required level of quality, operation and maintenance, as a social right of all sections of society and every citizen's essential entitlement. It is noted that water supply programme in 100% Centrally Sponsored Programme and is being implemented by the States as per the guidelines prepared by the Central Government. In this context the Committee fail to understand why the responsibility of implementing and O&M etc. has not been given to Panchayats in the guidelines as per the Constitutional provisions. In view of it, it is recommended that the guidelines should be suitably amended whereby the responsibility of implementing Drinking Water Supply Programme and O&M etc. is directly provided to Panchayats/legally authorised local authorities and the money is also directly released to Panchayats.

Quality Problem

2.63 As per the written note the Government data with regard to the quality problem in rural water sector is as below:—

Type of problem	Affected habitations	Affected population
Fluoride	30845	66 million
Arsenic	3111	53 lakh
Arsenic related skin manifestations	—	2 lakh
Iron	61942	—
Brackishness	34478	—

2.64 During the course of oral evidence the Secretary informed the Committee that out of 14,30,000 habitations, more than 1,30,000 habitations have become quality affected due to fluoride content, brackishness etc.

The Outlay earmarked for Quality Problem

2.65 As per the written replies, States can utilise 20% of the annual allocation under ARWSP for tackling the quality related problems.

Water Treatment Plants in the Country

2.66 The information regarding the number of water treatment plants installed in the country is as under:—

1.	**Defluoridation Plants Installed**		
	Hand Pump Attached Plants	—	349
	Fill and Draw Plants	—	283
2.	**Defluoridation Plants which are Working**		
	HPA Plants	—	43
	F&D Plants	—	197
3.	**Desalination Plants**		
	Installed	—	150
	Working	—	77
4.	**Iron Removal Plants**		
	Installed	—	9445
	Working	—	4440

2.67 When asked about the reasons for water treatment plants becoming non-functional it has been stated that the main reason is inadequate operation and maintenance after installation and lack of trained and experienced staff for O&M work.

2.68 The Committee find that adequate emphasis is not being given by the State Governments to address the quality problem of drinking water. Even if the Government data is to be believed, around 10% of the habitations are affected by one or the other type of contamination. It is further disturbing to note that water treatment plants are becoming non-functional due to inadequate operation & maintenance and lack of trained and experienced staff for O&M work. Further, water testing laboratories functioning in districts in rural areas are inadequately equipped. It is strongly recommended that adequate attention should be paid to solve the problem of contamination of water to ensure that the rural masses get safe drinking water. Further, more attention need to be given to the aspect of training to the staff responsible for O&M of water treatment plants. The Committee urge that necessary guidelines in this respect should be issued to the State Governments.

Human Resource Development (HRD)

2.69 As per Performance Budget, Rs. 5 crore were earmarked during 1999-2000 on Human Resource Development (HRD) out of which Rs. 3.60 crore were released. However, no expenditure has been reported.

2.70 When asked about the reasons for non-utilisation of funds under HRD, it has been mentioned in the written note that during the current financial year, Rs. 4.21 crore have been released under HRD till 16th March 2000. The low utilisation of funds as indicated in the performance budget is due to non-receipt of proposal of HRD activities from the State Governments in time. However, some proposals have since been received. As such it is likely that the full available funds during 1999-2000 will be utilised. Information regarding utilisation of the funds released will be available subsequently.

2.71 When asked how priority to HRD is justified in view of non-utilisation of funds under this head, it has been submitted by the Government that keeping in view the necessity for sustainable water supply, there is need of well trained manpower both in programme implementation wing and general public. In fact, success of the drinking water supply programme is linked with the level of awareness and updated skills possessed by the scheme-implementing officials and people of the rural areas. In order to achieve best possible results and proper use of resources, it would be prudent to accord high priority to HRD under the programme.

2.72 Though separate allocation for human resource development has been made during 1999-2000, the Committee note with concern that no expenditure has been reported by States out of the said allocation. In view of the necessity of well trained staff responsible for operation and maintenance of different drinking water systems/ sources, as admitted by the Government, the Committee urge that State Governments should be persuaded to give priority to human resource development.

Sustainability of Water Sources and System

2.73 As per the written note furnished by the Government the Rural Water Supply Sector is plagued by the emerging problems of sustainability (both source and system). Explaining the gravity of the problem, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted:

> "Systems have become defunct due to the fact that their design life is seven to ten years for a hand-pump and fifteen to twenty years for piped water supply. They have outlived their design life. Apart from that, a lot of these systems are lying defunct due to poor operation and maintenance."

The Secretary further stated:

> "....the emphasis is on the new construction rather than on operation and maintenance. We feel that when we try to cover excessive new habitations, the operation and maintenance get neglected."

2.74 As per the guidelines, upto 15% of the funds released every year under the ARWSP to the States/UTs may be utilised for operation and maintenance of assets created.

2.75 The Committee are constrained to note that the poor operation and maintenance of different drinking water systems is rampant everywhere due to which most of the systems are becoming defunct as admitted by the Secretary, during the course of oral evidence. They feel that serious attention should be paid towards this aspect and necessary instructions should be issued to the State Governments. In view of the gravity of the situation, it is recommended that flexibility should be provided to State Governments to make expenditure on O&M as per their requirement. The Committee therefore feel that the existing guidelines of making expenditure upto 15% on O&M should be suitably revised.

Monitoring

2.76 As per the written reply of the Government, the States are required to submit monthly, quarterly and annual physical and financial reports in respect of the programme implementation of both ARWSP & MNP. These reports are compiled at the central level in the Department of Drinking Water Supply and the compiled information gives the overall picture of physical and financial progress of the programme, which is found to be adequate. Additional information, if any required at any stage is obtained from the State Governments separately.

2.77 The Committee urge that the monitoring of the programme should be further strengthened to ensure 100% utilisation of the scarce resources allocated for the programme and to achieve the set objective. In view of the fact that a separate Department has been created to deal with the drinking water supply, it is urged that for effective monitoring, the officers of Central Government should make surprise visits to check the performance of the programme. The Committee further feel that as the programme involves social and economic uplift of the masses in relation to tackling this basic problem in rural areas, local MPs should more and more be involved in the implementation of this programme.

2.78 The Committee also urge that to have access to the latest data to strengthen the monitoring mechanism the latest technology like networking of Computer records available with implementing agencies/State Governments and the Department in the Centre should be done.

CHAPTER III

OVERALL SCENARIO OF RURAL SANITATION IN THE COUNTRY

3.1 As per the replies, at present over 16-20% of rural households have access to sanitation facilities. The Restructured Central Rural Sanitation Programme (RCRSP) has come into being from 1.4.1999. It moves away from the principle of State-wise allocation primarily based on poverty criteria to a "demand-driven" approach in a phased manner with a view to achieve atleast 35% coverage of rural population by the end of the 9th Plan period, subject to provision of funds by Planning Commission.

3.2 When asked about the total requirement of funds for providing 35% coverage of rural population by the end of the 9th Plan period, it has been stated by the Government that the Working Group for the 9th Plan recommended a provision of Rs. 6251 crore for coverage of 50% of the rural population with sanitation facilities during the plan period. For providing 35% coverage of rural population, the requirement would be suitably reduced.

Sanitation in Schools

3.3 As per the Sixth All India Educational Survey conducted by NCERT, out of 570455 primary schools in the country, 107986 schools have urinal and 61926 have lavatory facility.

When asked about the planning on the part of the Government to provide the basic sanitation facilities to all the schools in rural areas, it has been stated in the written reply that considering that the children play an effective role in popularising new ideas and concepts, and to tap their potential as the most persuasive advocates of the benefits of good sanitation practices in their own households, "School Sanitation" has been introduced as a separate component in the Restructured Central Rural Sanitation Programme (RCRSP). Under the Restructured programme, it is proposed to provide toilets at the cost of Rs. 20000/- per unit in rural schools in the county. The pattern of sharing of the cost among the Centre, State and the School/Panchayat will be in the ratio of 60:30:10.

Outlay under CRSP

Rs. in crore

3.4	8th Plan outlay	380
	Expenditure incurred	233.77
	9th Plan	
	Proposed outlay	3150
	Outlay agreed to by the Planning Commission	500

Performance during 1998-99

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Outlay/Provision	Release	Expenditure
1998-99	CRSP 100.00	67.00	121.06
	MNP 213.34		189.27

Performance during 1999-2000

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Outlay/Provision	Release (upto 31.1.2000)	Expenditure (upto Dec. 1999)
1999-2000	CRSP 110.00	50.46	44.19
	MNP 201.54		55.28

3.5 When asked how an expenditure of Rs. 121.06 crore against releases of Rs. 67 crore was made under CRSP during 1998-99, it has been clarified by the Government that it appears that misclassification of expenditure has been done by the State Governments. As such State Governments are being asked to clarify the position.

Further so far as under spending under MNP during 1998-99 is concerned, the Government have stated that the reason for underspending under MNP is attributed mainly to the non-release of funds by the State Finance Departments to the implementing agencies in the States.

3.6 When asked for the reason of poor position of expenditure during 1999-2000 upto December 1999 it has been stated by the Government that the Rural Sanitation Programme has been restructured with effect from 1.4.99 with 50% allocation for Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) in select districts and the balance 50% for the "allocation base" programme during the financial year 1999-2000. The project proposals under TSC from the State Governments were received late and hence the funds under TSC were released during December 1999 to March 2000. Further, the grounding of the projects is likely to take some time and therefore, the details of progress under the TSC are awaited.

3.7 When inquired whether any improvement in the implementation of the programme has been noticed in the current financial year *i.e.* 1999-2000 due to radical policy change, it has been stated by the Government that under the restructured programme, the allocation based programme is being phased out and Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) in a project mode has been introduced with effect from 1.4.99. It took some time for the projects to be prepared, examined and got approved. It is too early to assess the impact of the new programme, as the implementation of the sanctioned projects had just commenced.

3.8 As per data only 16% to 20% of the rural households are stated to have sanitation facilities. Equally disturbing is the position of school sanitation where only few schools have even urinal and lavatory facilities not to talk of the overall sanitation. The Committee are concerned to note that inspite of their recommending strongly in their earlier reports for enhancement of outlay and take necessary steps to improve the poor situation in the area of rural sanitation, nothing substantial has been done. Only Rs. 500 crore have been earmarked for 9th Plan whereas for achieving the stipulated target of covering 35% of rural population by the end of 9th Plan around Rs. 4375 crore are required as per the information provided by the Government. It is again strongly recommended that the Government should persuade the Planning Commission to enhance the outlay substantially so as to achieve the set objectives of covering at least 35% of the population by the end of the 9th Plan. The Committee would also like to recommend that while planning for providing sanitation facilities to schools in the rural areas it should be ensured that separate toilets are provided for girls.

3.9 The Committee are unhappy to note the poor monitoring of the programme by the Government. During 1998-99 as per their own data, the expenditure has been shown as Rs. 121.06 crore against release of Rs. 67 crore for which the Government have no clarification. Even after the lapse of two years, the position is yet to be checked from the State Governments. The Committee take serious view of the attitude of the Government towards one of their most important programme and would like that the monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened.

3.10 The Committee also recommend that with a view to augment the resources, Government should enlist the cooperation of local Member of Parliament and impress upon him to contribute towards this object from his MPLADS fund.

3.11 The Committee find that not only the allocation under the programme is meagre, but whatever little allocation is being made is not being spent fully. When asked for the reasons for under utilisation of funds, the Government put forward the plea that it took sometime for the projects to be prepared, examined and got approved. The Committee are not inclined to accept the plea of the Government in this regard and disapprove the way the programme has been restructured. They recommend that to ensure 100% utilisation of the scarce resources, in future proper planning in consultation with the State Governments and implementing agencies should be made before launching/restructuring any programme.

3.12 The Committee desire that more attention should be paid towards school sanitation as children are the best to be educated and trained in this regard. It is further urged that sanitation in the schools should not only be confined to construction of toilets but a holistic approach in this regard is required. It is strongly recommended that adequate allocation should be made for school sanitation.

It is further recommended that the implementing agencies should make use of the latest technology in respect of construction of toilets etc. Necessary instructions in this regard should be issued to the State Governments.

NEW DELHI;
18 *April*, 2000
29 *Chaitra*, 1922 *(Saka)*

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

Statement showing 8th Plan outlay (outlay sanctioned and expenditure made) and 9th Plan (outlay proposed and sanctioned) BE 1998-99, RE 1998-99 Actual 1998-99, BE 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001 (Plan)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Deptt. of Drinking Water Supply)

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	8th Plan		9th Plan		1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001		
		Outlay	Expenditure incurred	Outlay proposed to The Plg. Commn.	Outlay Agreed to by The Plg. Commn.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expenditure	Outlay Proposed to The Plg. Commn.	B.E.	% increase over R.E. 1998-99	Outlay proposed to The Plg. Commn.	B.E.	% increase over B.E. 1999-2000
	Plan Schemes													
1.	Rural Water Supply Programme	5100.00	4142.71	18000.00	8150	1627.00	1612.00	1611.05	3000.00	1800.00	10.63	3000.00	1960.00	8.89
2.	Rural Sanitation	380.00	233.77	3150.00	500.00	100.00	67.00	64.85	330.00	110.00	10.00	330.00	140.00	27.27
	Total Plan	5480.00	4376.48	21150.00	8650.00	1727.00	1679.00	1675.90	3330.00	1910.00	10.60	3330.00	2100.00*	9.95

*As Per M/o Finance instructions, 10% of the total outlay is to be shown separately in the Budget as hump sum provision for the benefit of North Eastern Region and Sikkim. Accordingly, 10% provision, which totals upto Rs. 210.00 crore, has been taken out from each scheme and shown separately in the budget under Major Head 2552.

APPENDIX II

Statement Showing 8th Plan outlay (outlay sanctioned and expenditure made) and 9th Plan (outlay proposed and sanctioned, B.E. 1998-99, R.E. 1998-99, Actual 1998-99, B.E. 1999-2000 and B.E. 2000-2001 (Non-Plan)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Deptt. of Drinking Water Supply)

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	8th Plan		9th Plan		1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001		
		B.E.	Expenditure incurred	Outlay proposed to The Plg. Commn.	Outlay Agreed to by The Plg. Commn.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expenditure	Outlay Proposed to The Plg. Commn.	B.E.	% Increase over B.E. 1998-99	Outlay proposed to The Plg. Commn.	B.E.	% increase over B.E. 1999-2000
	Non-Plan													
1.	Headquarter's Estt. of Deptt. of Drinking Water Supply	3.41	3.86	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	1.30	1.18	1.04	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	1.23	-5.38	Not Applicable to Non-Plan	1.29	4.88
	Total-Non-Plan	3.41	3.86			1.30	1.18	1.04		1.23	-5.38		1.29	4.88

APPENDIX III

Statement Showing expenditure and coverage of villages/habs under Rural Water Supply Programme

S.No.	Year	Expenditure (Year-wise) (ARWSP+MNP) (Rs. in Crore)	Coverage of Vill./Hab. (year-wise)	Cumulative Coverage of Vill./Hab.	%age increase (Year-wise) in Phy. achieve	Ratio Fin./Phy. (Year-wise) (Rs. in Crore)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	1986-87	799.48	54346	593898**	—	0.015
2.	1987-88	877.69	57978	651876	8.89	0.015
3.	1988-89	1019.34	55043	706919	7.79	0.019
4.	1989-90	1046.29	44228	751147	5.89	0.024
5.	1990-91	987.06	38804	789951	4.91	0.025
6.	1991-92	1197.80	36500	826451	4.42	0.033
7.	1992-93	1288.14	34360	860811	3.99	0.037
8.	1993-94	1422.25	41488	902299	4.60	0.034

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	1994-95	1660.01	70934	973233	7.29	0.023
10.	1995-96	2183.86	93272	1066506	8.75	0.023
11.	1996-97	2274.19	99651	1166156	8.55	0.023
12.	1997-98	2884.36	116994	1283150	9.12	0.025
13.	1998-99	3645.37	112933	1396083	8.09	0.032
14.	1999-2000	2851.270*	43476*	1439559	3.02	0.066

* Provisional
** Cumulative coverage up to 1986-87

APPENDIX IV

Financial Progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP and MNP) during 1998-99

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme								Minimum Needs Programme		
		Month	Opening balance as on 1.4.98	Allocation	Releases	Total Availability of funds (4+6)	Expenditure	Expen- as % of Available funds	Expend. as % of Allocation	Provision	Expenditure Allocation	Expend as of provision
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Andhra Pradesh	03	0.00	9991.36	9991.36	9991.36	9991.36	100.00	100.00	9991.36	9991.36	100
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	03	226.41	3623.00	2163.82	2390.23	1408.12	58.91	38.87	3137.00	2497.98	79
3.	Assam	03	2187.34	6120.00	6417.00	8604.34	3222.87	37.46	52.66	6905.00	5689.98	82
4.	Bihar	03	2119.74	11768.50	0.00	2119.74	850.24	40.12	7.22	4900.00	7818.58	159
5.	Goa	03	218.28	283.75	0.00	218.28	14.83	6.79	5.23	505.00	996.27	197
6.	Gujarat	03	1090.23	5860.51	6951.35	8041.58	6320.99	78.60	107.86	16510.00	14795.38	89

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
7.	Haryana	03	753.88	2190.91	2025.04	2778.92	2186.43	78.68	99.80	3410.00	3189.44	92
8.	Himachal Pradesh	03	81.62	1967.07	2913.27	2994.89	1992.50	66.53	101.29	6477.07	6795.21	104
9.	J&K	03	3233.82	6514.58	4659.41	7893.23	2735.37	34.65	49.60	7110.53	7110.53	100
10.	Karnataka	03	1110.59	9177.40	10070.63	11181.22	9472.45	84.72	103.21	10170.18	8526.65	83
11.	Kerala	03	719.87	4673.49	4673.49	5393.36	2158.62	58.56	67.59	5164.00	3027.99	58
12.	Madhya Pradesh	03	434.10	11063.07	11061.14	11495.24	10488.04	91.24	94.80	10981.14	9604.28	87
13.	Maharashtra	03	0.00	13301.46	16384.68	16384.68	41891.94	255.68	314.94	28975.72	25643.93	88
14.	Manipur	03	339.75	1330.00	5666.74	1006.49	357.07	35.48	26.85	1510.89	1134.24	75
15.	Meghalaya	03	304.72	1425.00	1709.00	2013.72	1157.05	57.46	81.20	1804.73	1793.71	99
16.	Mizoram	03	189.61	1018.00	1017.66	1207.27	1303.53	107.97	128.05	895.00	893.80	99
17.	Nagaland	03	624.64	1058.00	796.90	1421.54	428.23	30.12	40.48	1351.00	109.00	8
18.	Orissa	03	1126.41	5236.47	4793.75	5920.16	4615.58	77.96	88.14	4800.00	3566.32	74
19.	Punjab	03	247.55	1668.62	2205.28	2452.83	891.62	36.35	53.43	4527.00	1791.38	39

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
20.	Rajasthan	03	267.07	10954.54	11941.63	12208.70	10686.04	87.53	97.55	21375.00	16971.96	79
21.	Sikkim	03	0.00	434.00	1401.12	1401.12	411.12	29.34	94.73	1115.00	1170.00	104
22.	Tamil Nadu	03	1506.11	7922.54	10527.51	12033.62	11273.64	93.68	142.30	16400.00	21933.08	133
23.	Tripura	03	0.00	1262.00	2128.95	2128.95	2128.95	100.00	168.70	2205.86	2211.86	100
24.	Uttar Pradesh	03	4147.49	18537.93	16297.06	20444.55	18198.87	89.02	98.17	24549.00	21635.86	88
25.	West Bengal	03	1181.05	7169.63	6426.91	7607.96	6346.26	83.42	88.52	6500.00	6034.05	92
26.	A&N Islands	03	4.40	12.50	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	985.00	1254.69	127
27.	D&N Haveli	03	58.00	12.50	0.00	58.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	416.00	416.00	0
28.	Daman & Diu	03	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	206.00	173.93	84
29.	Delhi	03	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800.00	670.26	83
30.	Lakshadweep	03	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	150.00	150.00	100
31.	Pondicherry	03	9.66	5.00	0.00	9.66	1.79	18.53	35.80	96.00	109.12	113
	Total		22182.34	143611.83	137223.70	159406.04	151533.51	95.06	105.52	203923.48	187706.85	92

Summary		Budget	Releases	Expend.
ARWSP (Normal + DDP)	23187.25	159546.00	143988.16	157147.91
Monitoring & Evaluation		100.00	68.60	68.80
ARWSP (M&I Units)		250.00	232.55	232.55
Mini-Missions		1.00	0.00	0.00
Sub-Missions		2.00	15622.69	15284.56
Professional Services		300.00	270.00	270.00
Research		150.00	138.60	138.60
CAPART	1328.00	1.00	0.00	378.35
HRD/Training		500.00	191.75	73.80
IEC		450.00	179.87	2.16
MIS		1200.00	357.00	17.51
Exhibition		10.00	0.00	0.00
Seminar/Conference		90.00	2.82	1.35
Assistance from WHO/UNICEF		90.00	12.16	12.16
CPMC, Bombay-Other Charges		10.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	24515.25	162700.00	161064.20	173627.75

APPENDIX V

Financial Progress under Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP ANDMNP) during 1999-2000

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme								Minimum Needs Programme		
		Month	Opening balance as on 1.4.98	Allocation	Releases	Total Availability of funds (4+6)	Expenditure	Expend. as % of Available funds	Expend. As % of Allocation	Provision	Expenditure	Expend. as % of provision
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Andhra Pradesh	12	0.00	9143.26	12534.37	12534.37	8255.00	65.86	90.29	9283.51	8862	95
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	11	998.77	2476.00	1980.80	2979.57	1136.53	38.14	45.90	4286	1714.19	40
3.	Assam	12	5381.47	4180.00	2090.00	7471.47	3323.71	44.49	79.51	5535	4084.95	73
4.	Bihar	10	1269.50	9380.00	0.00	1269.50	335.48	28.43	3.58	4000	212.12	5
5.	Goa	10	203.45	352.92	0.00	203.45	15.83	7.78	4.49	493.3	240.91	48
6.	Gujarat	11	2063.30	6023.52	7406.52	9469.82	4767.39	50.34	79.08	21920	13621.96	62
7.	Haryana	12	592.49	1883.91	1507.12	2099.61	1911.20	91.03	101.45	3990	3268.36	81

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
8.	Himacha Pradesh	11	1002.39	2275.77	1820.61	2823.00	1502.82	53.23	68.04	5885.87	4415.77	75
9.	J & K	11	5157.86	6381.44	3190.72	8348.58	573.87	6.87	8.99	7221.27	2729.35	37
10.	Karnataka	09	2260.59	8402.25	8309.95	10570.54	4318.48	40.85	51.40	7648.79	3505.47	46
11.	Kerala	12	2234.74	4307.88	3446.30	5681.04	3018.14	53.13	70.06	5005	2871.85	57
12.	Madhya Pradesh	10	1007.20	9444.68	8830.44	9837.64	3558.24	36.17	37.67	10981.14	3580.75	32
13.	Maharashtra	12	0.00	13614.41	10891.52	10891.52	62954.89	578.02	462.41	21799	13476.51	61
14.	Manipur	11	611.20	907.00	0.00	611.20	88.89	14.54	9.80	1610.89	823.82	54
15.	Meghalaya	12	856.67	974.00	779.20	1635.87	639.08	39.07	65.61	1750	229.97	53
16.	Mizoram	12	0.00	696.00	348.00	348.00	298.85	86.88	42.94	698	326.16	46
17.	Nagaland	11	939.31	724.00	579.20	1518.51	362.00	2384.00	50.00	1524	0	0
18.	Orissa	11	2815.82	4847.93	4847.93	8663.75	1986.26	26.92	40.97	6111.2	1926.85	31
19.	Punjab	11	1561.21	1720.64	860.32	2421.53	521.74	21.55	30.32	3637.05	1009.48	27

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
20.	Rajasthan	11	1522.66	126776.22	10140.98	11663.64	5176.08	44.38	40.83	16300	5989.46	36
21.	Sikkim	12	990.00	460.83	695.59	1685.59	408.94	24.26	88.74	1115	734.61	65
22.	Tamil Nadu	12	0.00	6534.66	8958.28	8958.28	7925.53	88.47	121.28	16544	12863.5	77
23.	Tripura	09	0.00	862.00	1662.00	1662.00	431.00	25.93	50.00	1915.49	920.59	48
24.	Uttar Pradesh	12	2245.68	14775.00	11820.00	14065.68	8774.39	62.38	59.39	33703.67	13126.51	38
25.	West Bengal	12	1731.33	7008.15	5606.45	7337.78	2701.67	36.82	38.55	6500	2602.42	40
26.	A&N Islands	09	4.40	12.50	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	1040	674.46	55
27.	D&N Haveli	12	58.00	12.50	0.00	58.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	416	262.69	0.00
28.	Daman & Diu	12	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	206	251.87	126
29.	Delhi	12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	206	25.187	126
30.	Lakshadweep	10	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	133	83.16	62
31.	Pondicherry	12	7.87	5.00	0.00	7.87	6.00	76.24	120.00	190	73.96	38
	Total		35515.91	130112.47	108306.30	143822.21	124992.01	86.91	96.06	201627.63	105342.39	52

Summary		Budget	Releases	Expend.	
ARWSP (Normal + DDP)	37799.44	176379.00	113351.37	127035.04	
Monitoring & Evaluation		100.00	5.10	0.00	
ARWSP (M&I Units)		250.00	154.45	40.00	
Mini-Missions		0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sub-Missions		1.00	5457.34	203.34	
Professional Services		500.00	0.00	0.00	
Research		150.00	25.79	25.79	
CAPART	943.65	0.00	0.00	79.00	
HRD/Training		500.00	360.78	0.00	
IEC		550.00	53.50	0.00	
MIS		1500.00	1231.93	0.00	
Exhibition		10.00	0.00	0.00	
Seminar/Conference		25.00	0.00	0.00	
Assistance from WHO/UNICEF		25.00	0.00	0.00	
CPMC, Bombay—Other Charges			10.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total	38749.09	180000.00	120640.26	127383.17	

APPENDIX VI

List of Pilot Districts for Institutionalising Community Participation in Rural Water Supply Programme

S.No.	State	Pilot Districts Identified by the States		S.No.	State	Pilot Districts Identified by the States
1		2		3		4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1.	Chittoor	7.	Himachal Pradesh	17. Sumaur
		2.	Nalgonda	8.	Jammu & Kashmir	18. Srinagar
		3.	Prakasam			19. Udhampur
		4.	Khammam	9.	Karnataka	20. Bellary
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	5.	Lohit			21. Mysore
		6.	West Siang			22. Mangalore
3.	Assam	7.	Kamrup	10.	Kerala	23. Kasaragod
		8.	Sonitpur			24. Kollam
		9.	Jorhat	11.	Madhya Pradesh	25. Sehore
4.	Bihar	10.	Dhanbad			26. Gwalior
		11.	Vaishali			27. Narsinghpur
5.	Gujarat	12	Rajkot			28. Raisen
		13.	Mahsana			29. Hoshangabad
		14.	Surat	12.	Maharashtra	30. Dhule
						31. Amravati
6.	Haryana	15.	Karnal			32. Nanded
		16.	Yamuna Nagar			33. Raigad

1	2	3	4
13. Mizoram	34. Serchhip (Aizwal South)	19. Tamil Nadu	47. Coimbatore
14. Nagaland	35. Dimapur		48. Vellore
15. Orissa	36. Sundargrah		49. Cuddalore
	37. Ganjam		50. Perumbalur
	38. Balasore	20. Tripura	51. West Tripura
16. Punjab	39. Bathinda	21. Uttar Pradesh	52. Lucknow
	40. Moga		53. Mirzapur
17. Rajasthan	41. Alwar		54. Chandauli
	42. Barmer		55. Sonebhadra
	43. Sikar		56. Agra
	44. Jaipur	22. West Bengal	57. Midnapur
18. Sikkim	45. Sikkim South		58. N. 24 Parganas
	46. Sikkim West		

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 22ND MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1715 hrs. in Committee Room 'E' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri A. Brahmaniah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakrabortty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
10. Shri R.L. Jalappa
11. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
12. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shrimati Ranee Narah
15. Shri Ramchandra Paswan

16. Shri Chandresh Patel
17. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
18. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
19. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
20. Shri Maheshwar Singh
21. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
22. Shri D. Venugopal
23. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

24. Shri S. Agniraj
25. Shri N.R. Dasari
26. Shri C. Apok Jamir
27. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
28. Dr. Mohan Babu
29. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
30. Shri N. Rajendran
31. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
32. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
33. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi	—	*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman	—	*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra	—	*Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply)

1. Shri S.K. Tripathi	—	Secretary (DWS)
2. Shri Anil Kumar	—	Joint Secretary
3. Shri Satish Chandra	—	Joint Secretary
4. Shri P.K. Chakraborty	—	Addl. Adviser (TM)
5. Smt. P.V. Valsala G. Kutty	—	Director
6. Shri N. Kittu	—	OSD (T)

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed Shri S.Agniraj, M.P. who has been nominated as a member of the Committee with effect from 16th March, 2000. Thereafter the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply in the Ministry of Rural Development to the sitting. He also drew the attention of the witnesses to the provision of Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

3. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the said Department in connection with the examination of the Demands for Grants of that Department for the year 2000-2001.

4. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VIII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 5TH APRIL, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1615 hrs. in Committee Room 'B' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri A. Brahmaniah
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
8. Prof. Kailasho Devi
9. Shrimati Hema Gamang
10. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
11. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
12. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
13. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
14. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
15. Shrimati Ranee Narah
16. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
17. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
18. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
19. Shri Nikhilananda Sar

Rajya Sabha

20. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
21. Shri Kamendu Bhattacharjee
22. Shri N.R. Dasari
23. Shri C. Apok Jamir
24. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
25. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi	—	*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman	—	*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra	—	*Under Secretary*

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

3. The Committee adopted the said draft Report on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) with certain modifications as indicated in *Annexure*.

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the said Report after getting it factually verified from the Department concerned and present the same to the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(See para 3 of Minutes dated 5.4.2000)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	3	2.2	—	*For* para 2.2 *read* the following: 'The Committee hope that with the creation of a separate Department of Drinking Water Supply, more focussed attention would be given to achieving the target of making available potable drinking water to all habitations and schools within the time-frame of five years (2000-2005) stipulated in the National Agenda for Governance. To this end, the Committee urge:— • high-level political coordination between the Centre and the States to achieve the time-bound target in an area which falls primarily within the competence of the States; • entrusting the fundamental responsibility of planning and implementation of the programmes of the Department to the Panchyat Raj Institutions; and • the provision of adequate funds on a priority basis to achieve the social right of all citizens to potable drinking water in accordance with the Directive Principles of State Policy.

1	2	3	4	5
				While appreciating the importance being attached by the Government, to the supply of drinking water, the Committee feel that the Central Rural Sanitation Programme is no less important than the drinking water supply. They therefore, recommend that the said programme should also be given due importance and efforts made to make it a success.'
2.	6.	2.6	6	*After* 'Action Plan' *insert* 'clearly indicating the total requirement of funds year-wise.'
3.	6.	2.7	8	At the beginning of the para *insert* the word 'Comprehensive'
4.	6.	—	—	*After* para 2.7 *insert* the following 'As per para 2.9.2 of the guidelines, the States/UTs shall prepare annual action plans six months before the commencement of the financial year. Thus for the year 2000-2001, the State Governments were required to finalise their annual plans by October, 1999. When asked whether States/UTs have furnished their annual plans, by October, 1999 as stipulated in the guidelines it has been submitted in the written reply that none of the States submitted annual plan by October, 1999. It has further been submitted by the Government that action plans of most of the States would be finalised by the end of May, 2000.'

1	2	3	4	5
5.	9	—	2	*For* 'action plans' *read* 'comprehensive action plans'
6.	9	—	2	*After* line 2, *insert* 'Further none of the State Governments furnished their annual action plans by October, 1999 as stipulated in the guidelines, thus wasting at least a sixth of the financial year, 2000-2001. The Committee would, therefor, like to be apprised of the details of those States/UTs which did not furnish the annual plans as stipulated in the guidelines.'
7.	9	2.13	9	*Before* 'coverage' *insert* 'full'
8.	9	2.13	13	*After* 'recommend that' *insert* 'through high level, concerted coordination between the Government and the Planning Commission.'
9.	9	—	—	*After* para 2.13 *insert* the following: '2.14 The Government and the Planning Commission should urgently consider at the highest possible level, in consultation with high-level State authorities, the exponential increases in financial allocations and disbursements required to attain the drinking water goals of the National Agenda for Governance, and the political

1	2	3	4	5
				and administrative steps that need to be taken, including the key question of the empowerment of the Panchayats in this regard, as provided for in the Constitution. In this context the role of the Gram Sabhas needs specific attention, with the role of the Gram Sabhas in Fifth Schedule Areas being defined in terms of the provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 passed by Parliament. The Department should also coordinate with the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Women and Child Development) the responsibilities which could be entrusted to the Gram Mahila Sabhas set up under the Indira Mahila Yojana. Moreover, the disturbingly low priority being given to rain water conservation, including traditional methods of water conservation, as well as the minscule expenditure being incurred on this vital matter, needs urgent high-level review.
10.	12	—	—	*After* para 2.22 *Insert* 'When asked about the details of the main technological or managerial insights attributable to RGNDWM, it has been submitted by the Government that technical expertise on water supply sector especially on sustainability and

1	2	3	4	5
				quality issues is available in the Mission, which helps in policy formulation, strategies for implementation and evaluation of programme in the sector.'
11.	13	2.23	4	*Omit* 'RGNDWM'
12.	13	2.23	5 to 7	*Omit* the following: 'They also fail to understand the rationale behind calling the central funds allocated for MNP as State's matching contribution whereas the allocation is being made by the Central Government.'
13.	13	2.23	—	*Add* at the end 'The Committee are concerned at the apparent confusion over the precise relationship between the RGNDWM and the newly-created Department. They recommend that the relationship be clarified in terms of the "mode" established for societal mission in 1986 and the administrative/financial responsibilities which now devolve on the new Department. The Committee regret that, despite having been requested to do so, the Department has not been able to furnish any information about the technological and managerial insights attributable to RGNDWM, and suggest that these be taken into consideration in defining the role of the Mission and its relationship to the Department.'

1	2	3	4	5
14.	14	2.24	—	*After* Para 2.24 *insert* the following:

'The Committee observe from the data given above and in *Appendix III;*

- there has been a drastic fall of nearly Rs. 800 crore between 1998-99 and 1999-2000 in expenditure reported by States/ UTs and implementing agencies;
- the number of habitations covered has shrunk by more than half, from 1.13 lakh in 1998-99 to 0.43 lakh (provisional) in 1999-2000;
- this has resulted in a dramatic decrease in the annual percentage growth of physical achievement from over 9 per cent and 8 per cent respectively in the previous two years to just over 3 per cent in the last financial year;
- that it took 13 years for the ratio of financial to physical achievement to double from 1986 to 1999, whereas in a single year, 1999-2000, the ratio has more than doubled.

The Committee desire that the implications of these serious shortfalls be carefully assessed by the Government and corrective

1	2	3	4	5
				action taken urgently. Equally, it is essential that a scientific State-wise/ district-wise survey be made of 'private water sources with accessibility to the public', to ensure that this newly included source is properly estimated and fully tapped.'
15.	15.	2.25	—	*Omit* para 2.25
16.	18.	2.38	—	*For* para 2.38 *read* the following: 'As regards Delhi, the Committee would like that some outlay under ARWSP should be earmarked for maintenance, quality related problems etc., as these are also components of ARWSP though coverage of habitations in Delhi has been completed.'
17.	20.	—	—	*After* para 2.41 *insert* the following: 'The Committee are not moved by the argument of the Government that loading all O&M costs on the Panchayats is the optimal way of ensuring community participation in the maintenance of drinking water assets. The Government do not appear to have taken into account the glaring variations in the financial allotments to Panchayats as between different States nor to the continuing parlous state of panchayat finances notwithstanding the directives of the Tenth Finance Commission or the

1	2	3	4	5
				recommendations of the State Finance Commissions. Until the Constitutional obligation of ensuring the "sound finances" of the Panchayats is met in adequate measure, the Panchayats will not be able to operate and maintain drinking water facilities at the level which will give "satisfaction" to all categories of users—which is the fundamental assumption behind this scheme. The end result of loading the entire financial responsibility for O&M on users/ Panchayats could be that the better-off will be better provided for and the worse-off will be neglected, or even abandoned. This is unacceptable. The Committee urge the Government to reconsider this matter to ensure that the proposed pilot projects are successfully implemented with a view to ensuring the rapid extension of the scheme to all districts. Moreover, it is the right and responsibility of the Government to establish criteria for the identification of districts for pilot projects. The Committee regret the voluntary abnegation of responsibility for this by the Government. Finally, it is the responsibility of the Government to sensitize external agencies to the need for providing local inputs in project formulation and the implementation of their "shelf of projects" and the imperative of rooting their proposed institutional set-up in the Constitutional scheme of elected local self-Government.'

1	2	3	4	5
18.	23	2.49	3 from bottom	*Before* 'is' *insert* 'specifically their financial capacity'
19.	27	2.57	11 to 13	*For* 'yet the responsibility of endowing the above mentioned powers with Panchayats has been indicated to be with the State Governments.' *Read* 'legally authorised local authorities, yet the Government appear to be hesitant over using their full persuasive powers to urge State Governments at the highest possible level to devolve to the Panchayats/ legally authorised local authorities the required finances and executive powers, authority and responsibility to fulfil the high duty which ought to be vested in the Panchayats of ensuring drinking water facilities for all at the required level of quality, operation and maintenance, as a social right of all sections of society and every citizen's essential entitlement.'
20.	40	3.8	—	*Add* at the end 'The Committee would also like to recommend that while planning for providing sanitation facilities to schools in the rural areas it should be ensured that separate toilets are provided for girls. The Committee also recommend that with a view to augment the resources, Government should enlist the cooperation of local Member of Parliament and impress upon him to contribute towards this object from his MPLADS fund.'